IPEA
EPO
D-80298 Munich
Germany

17 May 2004

Dear Sirs

PCT/GB03/00947
Our ref: Magpie

Thank you for your Written Opinion dated 17th March 2003. The Opinion is an auto-generated Opinion which states in essence that the invention as claimed lacks novelty and/or inventive step in light of the art cited in the Search Report.

The Search Report cites 4 category X documents:

D1 WO 02 17075 (Symbian)

D2 Electronic Climatical Scheduler (IBM)

D3 Universal information appliance (IBM)

D4 EP 0829704 (Hitachi)

In light of the citations, the applicant files replacement pages as follows:

Replacement pages 5 – 9 and 20 - 22 to replace the same pages as originally filed

Triplicate copies will follow with the postal copy of this fax; an additional set of pages marked to show all changes will also follow.

Claim 1 of the present application now states:

Origin Limited
Twisden Works, Twisden Road, London NW5 1DN Tel: +44 (0)20 7424 1950 Fax: +44 (0)20 7209 0643
E-mail: peter.langley@origin.co.uk www.origin.co.uk Registration no. 2211999

1. A method of displaying data on a wireless information device, in which data supplied from a remote data supplier is automatically displayed within an application running on the device, and changes to alert the user to new data or to represent that new data;

characterised in that data from several different data suppliers is received by the device and the device is programmed to present a menu list of the different data types available within a given application, such that selecting a particular data type from the menu list causes data from a given data supplier, but no other supplier, to be displayed within that application.

This places the content of original Claim 16 into Claim 1.

None of the prior art disclose this approach. For example, **D1** does not disclose a menu list of the different data types available within a given application, such that selecting a particular data type from the menu list causes data from a given data supplier, but no other supplier, to be displayed within that application. **D2** and **D3** were not cited against original Claim 16. **D4** does not disclose the approach of enabling data from several different data suppliers to be received by the device: only a single data supplier appears to be envisaged.

Hence, the invention as now re-formulated, deals with displaying on a wireless information device, data from a remote data supplier, and doing so entirely within an application, running on the device. In **D1**, data from several different data suppliers is envisaged, but no mechanism for effectively enabling the user to select or choose data from different data suppliers is disclosed. The objective technical problem could therefore be said to be how to select data from a specific data supplier for display within an application. The Claim 1 solution is the use of a menu list of data *types*, as opposed to data *suppliers*.

The use of a menu list of data *types* is not inherently obvious in the context of selecting a *source* of data in order to automatically populate an existing application with data from that source. Identifying a source of data in a browser application happens by the user

selecting a data supplier from a bookmarked list of data suppliers. But using a browser, a user cannot select a bookmarked data *type* and then be taken directly to data from a specific data supplier. The present invention achieves this: see for example "Selecting 'Sport' in the drop down menu folder list will show information from Sky Sports services, including football match objects, as shown in Figure 4.." page 12 line 25 – 26.

It is the unusual combination of the menu list of data *types* (e.g. as shown in Figure 3: including, Sport, Entertainment, TV Guide etc.) enabling a specific data *supplier* to be selected that is unusual and inventive; yet it has many advantages to a user since a listing of data types in the menu list is far easier to understand than a list of names of data suppliers, especially as those names may well not be at all descriptive.

In the light of the above arguments, reconsideration is respectfully requested. Should the examiner require further clarification, a second Written Opinion is requested.

Yours faithfully,

Peter Langley